

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-6524

ROY HORTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, via Janet Reno,
United States Attorney General; GARLAND
HORACE, Deputy United States Marshal, and/or
John Doe, Deputy United States Marshal; GARY
BARRETT, Deputy United States Marshal; DAVID
SMITH, Deputy United States Marshal; JERRY
TOOTHMAN, Lieutenant, FCI, Morgantown; V. L.
LONDON, Unit Manager, FCI, Morgantown; BRENDA
L. FUTTEN, Case Manager, FCI, Morgantown;
DENNIS R. BIDWELL, Warden, FCI, Morgantown;
G. L. INGRAM, Regional Director, Bureau of
Prisons; KATHLEEN HAWKS, Director, Bureau of
Prisons; JAMES M. POOL, d/b/a Law Offices of
James M. Pool; JERRY JAKE HEDRICK, Chief Jail
Administrator; TIMOTHY L. BOWEN, Chief Jail
Administrator; JACK ROOP, Director WVA
Regional Jail Authority; SERGEANT CASTO,
Correctional Officer, Central Regional Jail;
JAMES M. HAMRICK, Records Clerk, Central
Regional Jail; NAOMIA NESTER, Nurse, Central
Regional Jail; BETTYE SMELLS, Nurse, Central
Regional Jail; KATHY MCCAULEY, Counselor,
Northern Regional Jail; KEVIN GOOD, Correc-
tional Officer/Hearing Officer; MARTIN P.
SHEEHAN, d/b/a Sheehan, Nuggent, and Sheehan,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Clarksburg. William M. Kidd, Senior District Judge. (CA-97-10-1)

Submitted: August 28, 1997 Decided: September 17, 1997

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Roy Horton, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West 1994 & Supp. 1997) and denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court. Horton v. United States, No. CA-97-10-1 (N.D.W. Va. Feb. 6, 1997 and Mar. 7, 1997). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED